DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 131 HE 024 176

AUTHOR Diessner, Rhett
TITLE The Mastery in Learning Project at Orchards Elementary School with the Consultancy of Lewis-Clark State College, Lewiston, Idaho.
SPONS AGENCY National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 42p.; This report is one of a group gathered by the AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project, funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. For related documents see HE 024 163-175. Additional support was received from Lewiston School District, Lewis-Clark State College, Idaho Education Association, and the Lewiston Education Association.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; Consultation Programs; *Cooperation; Curriculum Development; Demonstration Programs; *Educational Change; Elementary Education; Mastery Learning; *Participative Decision Making; Personal Autonomy; School Community Relationship; Student Participation; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *AASCU ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project; Lewis Clark State College ID; Lewiston Independent School District ID

ABSTRACT

This report describes activities from 1986 through 1990 of the Mastery in Learning Project, which focused on "restructuring the school" and "sharing decision making" at one elementary school in Lewiston, Idaho. Based on need surveys of various constituents of school life (administrators, students, teachers, and parents), a faculty-led movement within the school formed four guidance committees: a Teacher-to-Teacher Committee, a Teacher-to-Administrator Committee, a Teacher-to-Student Committee, and a Teacher-to-Community/Parents Committee. A fifth committee, the Steering Committee had representation from the other four committees and the building principal. From an initial focus on faculty autonomy in shared decision making with administrators, the faculty moved towards democracy and shared decision making within their classrooms, involving students in curriculum decisions, playground arbitration, and other aspects of their school lives. Appendixes include a school statement on shared decision making, a survey for curriculum input, and a faculty inventory and its results. Contains 15 references. (Author/DB)

ED328131

The Mastery in Learning Project at Orchards Elementary School with the Consultancy of Lewis-Clark State College Lewiston, Idaho

For information, contact Dr. Rhett Diessner, Assistant Professor of Education and Psychology, Lewis-Clark State College, Lewiston, ID 83501. Funding for the project was provided by the National Education Association, Lewiston School District, Lewis-Clark State College, Idaho Education Association, and the Lewiston Education Association. The project began in September 1986.

HE 024 176

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rhett Diessner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory is a two-year project seeking to establish and test a model system for collecting and disseminating information on model programs at AASCU-member institutions--375 of the public four-year colleges and universities in the United States.

The four objectives of the project are:

- To increase the information on model programs available to all institutions through the ERIC system
- To encourage the use of the ERIC system by AASCU institutions
- To improve AASCU's ability to know about, and share information on, activities at member institutions, and
- To test a model for collaboration with ERIC that other national organizations might adopt.

The AASCU/ERIC Model Programs Inventory Project is funded with a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, in collaboration with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at The George Washington University.

Abstract

In 1986 Orchards Elementary School was selected by the National Education Association to be one of twenty-six schools in America to participate in the NEA's Mastery in Learning Project. The project formally extended through the Spring of 1990. The main goal of this project focused on "restructuring the school" and "shared decision making". Based on need surveys of various constituents of school-life -- administrators, students, teachers, and parents -- a faculty led movement within the school formed four guidance committees: a Teacher-to-Teacher Committee, a Teacher-to-Administrator Committee, a Teacher-to-Student Committee, and a Teacher-to-Community/Parents Committee. A fifth committee, the Steering Committee had representation from the other four committees and the building Principal. From an initial focus on faculty autonomy in shared decision making with administrators, the faculty has moved towards democracy and shared decision making within their classrooms, involving students in curriculum decisions, playground arbitration, and other aspects of their school lives. Consultants from the Division of Education at Lewis-Clark State College assisted Orchards Elementary School through many aspects of their school restructuring project.

The Mastery in Learning Project at Orchards Elementary School

Introduction and Background

Shared-decision making, or grassroots democratic process, has been the guiding theme of Orchards Elementary School's restructuring. An early group decision was to administer a Faculty Inventory (available through the NEA) to begin a process of coming to consensual agreement upon what aspects of the school to focus restructuring. Collation of the completed inventories indicated that issues of communication in four domains needed the most dramatic change. These four domains were transformed into four action committees at Orchards: A Teacher-to-Administrator committee, a Teacher-to-Community/Parent committee, a Teacher-to-Teacher committee, and a Teacher-to-Student committee. Additionally, a Steering Committee, made up of representatives from each of the four committees and the building principal, guides the restructuring and development of the school (see Appendix A for the Orchards Statement of Shared Decision Making). Selected aspects of the Faculty Inventory were administered to faculty near the end of formal project, to again define specific foci to aim the continuance of restructuring. The results of this second administration are reported in Appendix D.

Description

To appreciate the goals of the program, the following paragraphs will outline the various goals of the four

restructuring committees at Orchards.

The Teacher-to-Teacher Committee desired to create greater positive reinforcement among faculty by establishing a Sunshine Committee, which they have done. Another goal was to create, and have ongoing, grade-to-grade (e.g., the two 4th grade teachers meet with the two 3rd grade teachers) meetings to coordinate teaching styles among staff members. Also intended was to continue to allow teachers to have opportunities to observe each other, and this has been continued, although only a few teachers have opted for it, so far. The goal for 1989-90 was to get more teachers involved in peer observation, and to post a "menu" of interesting programs and activities to observe, such as cooperative learning classrooms, classrooms using the Learning Styles Inventory, different classroom management strategies, and specific curriculum concerns. Their goal of increasing teachers' awareness of learning styles was accomplished by most teachers attending a conference wherein Dr. Rita Dunn spoke, and then writing a district grant (which was funded) to obtain Learning Style Inventories (LSI). These have been completed with students in three classrooms, and their teachers next Fall plan to alter their classrooms to incorporate the findings from the LSI. It is intended that for 1989-90 that the rest of the classrooms in the school will complete the LSI, and their teachers given feedback to allow them the option of changing teaching approaches based on that input. The goal of developing guidelines for substitute

teachers was accomplished by the committee obtaining and distributing a pre-packaged system to aid instructors to prepare information for their substitutes. It was intended that a short questionnaire be given substitutes and teachers to assess the effectiveness of the system, but that has not been done. They also revised the scheduling system by having resource, chapter one and speech conferencing on the first Tuesday of each month, and informally interviewed teachers about its efficacy.

The Student-to-Teacher Committee initiated the creation of a school constitution. They accomplished this, and sent home a copy with every student in the school, including a form for the parents to sign, indicating they had read it. This committee was interested in Another goal was to expand the Conflict Managers Program (specifically trained students mediating problem resolution for students having conflicts on the playground) to include the primary grades, and that was accomplished. Two primary teachers were trained in the conflict manager system, and it was successfully implemented. This committee also had a flyer printed and distributed to parents explaining the conflict manager program. Goals that were not met this last year, but that have been placed on the agenda for 1989-90 are: collecting records of past citizenship grades (or establishing a way to measure citizenship progress school-wide); setting up a parents advisory committee; creating a student committee for discussing behavior programs and/or establish a student council; and to

continue to work on democratic discipline and developing a building based handbook on this topic.

The Teacher-to-Administrator Committee set three goals for itself for 1988-89: 1) study the rotating convener faculty meetings, and adjust to meet staff needs, 2) complete in-service training in math CRT, and 3) research supervisory methods for assisting teachers in instruction. The convener style was found to be fairly well received, and, as shown by the latest survey, most faculty prefer it over the old method. Due to action in the central administration the math CRT inservice was not able to be completed as scheduled. The principal has attended two workshops this past year on supervision and evaluation of teachers, and the central administration is approving a plan district-wide to guide supervisory methods. The goals that this committee has set for 1989-90 include training teachers in the use of PSInet, and a building-wide discipline procedure incorporating Teacher Support groups for dealing with troublesome students, and staying in closer contact with the district's social worker.

The Teacher-to-Community Committee set several aesthetic and functional goals. Successful ventures included: organizing a schedule to display student collections in the entrance-way trophy case; hanging a picture of the school mascot in the gym; parent luncheon schedule; monthly birthday recognition/school pride day assemblies. Another goal was to build an enclosed passageway between the two school buildings; an architectural

cost estimate was established, but no funding was obtained. To work toward a professional image in the community the Committee obtained information on obtaining "business" cards for the faculty (and plans to distribute those next year), and placed personal histories of teachers in the Orchards newsletter. The Committee sponsored two parent workshops this year on drug abuse and parent conferencing (although they had hoped to sponsor four), and submitted a "parenting tip" in each Orchards newsletter. Some work was begun on their goal of researching and studying parent involvement literature, and more effective ways to invite parents to school functions; but a more thorough search is warranted. There was the intention to survey students about school pride and to research school pride issues, but this was not completed. For 1989-90 the committee plans to continue to pursue obtaining an enclosed passageway between buildings, to schedule two more parent workshop nights (perhaps on parenting skills and intoxicant abuse), to maintain relations with the PTA, to contribute to the school and district newsletters, to investigate development of parent support groups and how to get parents more involved in schools, and to bring more vitality to school (such as setting up a monthly "crazy day").

The NEA did not donate funds directly to the schools in the Mastery in Learning Project. They did provide assistance in terms of information and networking among the schools and with the NEA. The first three years of the project the local School

District provided funds for substitutes to allow every teacher in the Orchards' Elementary School one-half day per month release time to meet with the restructuring committees. Lewis-Clark State College provided a faculty member with one-quarter release time to work as a consultant for assisting with the restructuring as well, although by the fourth year of the project this was reduced to one-eighth release time. Various institutions, such as the Lewiston Education Association and Idaho Education Association, provided funds for specific projects, such as production of a video-tape documenting the progress of the first two and one-half years of the project.

Restructuring has both qualitative and quantitative aspects. In general, one hopes for major qualitative change (a different kind of power-structure, a new way of making decisions), rather than quantitative change which aims at make a current structure more efficient (fine-tuning). These two types of change do interact. For instance, the Orchards faculty, taking on a role usually reserved for the Principal, developed a much more efficient scheduling pattern for overall classes in the school. Although this is a quantitative (minor) change, it boosted morale and it allowed the teachers more time to work on qualitative restructuring.

During restructuring there was an emphasis on using "the knowledge base" in education to inform faculty decisions. The faculty have been strongly attracted to the democratic discipline

methods advocated by Adler and Dreikurs (Dreikurs & Grey, 1968; Dreikurs, & Cassels, 1974). With assistance from the Lewis-Clark State College consultant they examined computer-searches of both ERIC and Psychological Abstracts, and found little data-based research on the effectiveness of this model. However, as the philosophy of this model was congruent with Orchards faculty's vision of discipline, they requested that the consultant teach a course for credit through Lewis-Clark State College on democratic discipline. In regard to restructuring: the teachers initiated their own concerns, and sought ways of accomplishing those concerns. They sought information in the traditional "knowledge base" (by using the consultant to search for information on democratic discipline), and finding little, sought to create their own knowledge base through the creation of a building-based handbook on discipline. Although the teachers have not framed this as "action research" (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Perry-Sheldon & Allain, 1987), it has the rudiments of this approach.

Curriculum Restructuring

In a traditional manner, curriculum development is usually thought of as a content decision, i.e., what "facts" should be taught in what "subject". The curriculum decisions that Orchards has focused upon, however, impact two other critical areas: (a) the process or method of making and imparting curriculum, and (b) the hidden curriculum. In this sense, rather than teaching "about" democracy, Orchards faculty have emphasized curriculum

methods that create democratic citizens through participation in shared-decision making. This includes important areas of life that are often part of a schools "hidden curriculum", rather than overt objectives. Examples of the hidden curriculum include how to resolve conflict between students, how to resolve discipline problems between students and teachers, and how students can help each other learn.

Processes and accomplishments of curriculum development at Orchards

In the beginning of the Mastery in Learning Project at Orchards elementary school, the teachers, administrators, parents, and students were involved in setting goals based on a needs assessment. The Faculty Inventory, an instrument provided by the NEA, was itself a democratic process, in that each teacher was voting for the most important areas of development for the school. The results of this assessment showed that what teacher's greatly valued was the improvement of discipline in and out of the classroom. One of the greatest successes of the Orchards faculty Teacher-to-Student committee was the conflict manager system developed for mediating disputes on the playground. The primary goal of this system was for conflict managers to assist other students in the peaceful expression and early resolution of conflicts on the playground. Conflict managers are selected through a shared process of nomination and election by students and confirmation by teachers. The conflict

managers wear red smocks on the playground and only get involved in a difficulty if three criteria are met; (a) it is a non-physical dispute, (b) the students involved in the dispute agree to be helped by the conflict managers, and (c) the disputants agree to solve the problem.

The entire classroom receives instruction by their teacher on the role of conflict managers, the goal of peaceful resolution, how to share feelings, and cooperation. This instruction meets curricular goals of the health program, such as "understanding feelings" and "positive action"; the social studies program, such as how people can solve conflict non-violently; and the citizenship program. Orchards teachers' report that since this program began many students have appeared to become active problem solvers of real problems, they have assumed more responsibility for their own actions, and they have found more positive ways of meeting their own social needs. Parents have reported to teachers that the effects have spilled over into the family and have helped their children solve problems among themselves more effectively. Teachers have noticed that students who have been selected to be conflict managers have improved their leadership skills, appear to have an increased their self-esteem, and express more often a belief that they can be of benefit to others. It is hoped that by learning how to negotiate conflict at school that these students will generalize this ability into others settings and to their future

lives.

Another area in which the Teacher-to-Student committee is struggling to make a democratic difference in citizenship and the hidden curriculum is with misbehavior and discipline problems in the classroom, hallways, lunchroom as well as the playground. To form a firm basis, this committee worked to develop an Orchards School Constitution, which had administrator, teacher, student, and parent involvement in its creation. It includes a Bill of Rights which lists the rights and responsibilities of students, teachers, administrators, and parents. Through group decision-making the teachers found the democratic ideal of self-regulation to be of greatest worth: "A unique feature of this plan is that it is based upon self-regulation, which is the ability to control oneself."

This search for democratic discipline methods led the teachers to request in-service and college courses that emphasized the logical consequences methods of Dreikurs (Dreikurs & Grey, 1968; Dreikurs & Cassels, 1974; Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper; 1982), and the just community methods of Kohlberg (Murphy, 1988; Powers, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989; Reimer, Paolitto, & Hersh, 1983). Application of logical consequences and just community involves students in setting their own limits and benefits as is appropriate to their maturity level. The more mature the students, the more power the teacher shares with them.

Although discipline is not always considered a curricular issue, what is more important than the objectives of teaching our students self-regulation, fairness, and respect for others? Based on their initial exposure to this work and attempts to institute it in the classrooms, the teachers have designed their own Spring 1990 college course which will focus on eight objectives, that will become the eight chapters of the Orchards Manual on Democratic Discipline:

1. Introduction and Philosophy for Democratic Discipline
2. Consistency in Terms and Vocabulary Across Grade Levels
3. Logical Consequences for Misbehavior Across Grade Levels
4. The Effect of Stages of Social Reasoning on Classroom Democracy
5. Disciplinary Tracking: Or how we can help a child for more than a single nine months
6. How to start off the Democratic Year
7. The Role of the "Teach To's"
8. The Use of Teacher Assistance Teams to address students' development.

The Teacher-to-Teacher committee has been working to affect curriculum in two ways. One, they organized the grade-to-grade meetings in which teachers get together to integrate curriculum content and method. The curricular methods that worked for specific children and the curricular content that was mastered and the content that wasn't mastered are the topics of discussion

in these meetings. Respect for students' learning is the focus in the grade-to-grade meetings; the teachers in the upcoming year take the responsibility to include the objectives that weren't mastered the year before, and delete objectives for students who have already mastered them.

A second impact of the Teacher-to-Teacher committee has been sensitizing teachers to differing learning styles to influence curricular methods. Many Orchards teachers have attended Rita Dunn's workshops on assessing and teaching to differing learning styles (Dunn, 1984). The teachers perceive this as an indirect way of involving students in making processional curricular decisions. Once the student and teacher understand the student's preferred learning style, they are in a position to adapt curriculum content to that style. Looking toward "worth", teachers frame this approach as being child-centered; teaching for the needs of the child, rather than the convenience of the teacher. The teachers themselves wrote a grant proposal and consequently received district funds to acquire the Learning Styles Inventory and have begun assessing their students with this instrument with the goal of operationalizing the results.

Another teacher led restructuring movement at Orchards has been cooperative learning. This seems to have stemmed from one moral and one strategic value that many teachers at Orchards share. The moral value is that students should learn to help

each other. The strategic value is that students may master the pre-set district objectives better when learning cooperatively. Cooperative learning has taken two tracks -- one intra-class and the other inter-class. The intra-class level arranges the students into two pairs of partners joined to make learning teams of four members each. Partners and teams are changed every 6 weeks. The teams and partners take an active role in deciding what methods they will use to meet learning objectives. The students make use of a highly organized system of tracking their accomplishments and they receive various awards for point totals that indicate mastery.

Inter-class cooperation has taken the form of a whole class of older students getting together with a lower level class and tutoring them. For example, 4th graders help 1st graders on a weekly basis in both language arts and computer skills and 5th graders help the 2nd graders on a weekly basis in reading and math. Teachers were quick to point out that learning occurs both directions, i.e., the older students remember facts and concepts they had forgotten and the younger students learn new information in a highly responsive situation. Both students learn how to receive and give help in the experience.

The Teacher-to-Administrator committee has trained faculty in the use of computer hardware and software (PSInet), provided by IBM and NEA, that allows an easy linkage with the 26 other schools involved in the Mastery in Learning Project's school

restructuring. Being involved in this computer network allows sharing of curriculum content and methods among schools quickly and is being increasingly utilized by Orchards faculty. PSInet has also been a stimulus to encourage the dialogue of questioning, such as, "What has worked at your school?" "Do you teach keyboarding? At what grade level?" "What discipline system has been effective in your school? Does it have a data base?"

The Orchards faculty and the Teacher-to-Administrator committee have been instrumental in the district specific Criterion Referenced Testing (CRT) program. The use of CRTs is more democratic than using nationally normed standardized testing as it is specifically sensitive to the district's curriculum objectives. When the CRT program was being planned several years ago, the Orchards faculty expressed their concern over the creation of the tests. Since that time teachers throughout the district, including many from Orchards, have been members of the committees that are developing the specific items upon which the students in the district will be examined for mastery.

<u>The roles of teacher and student in the curriculum development process and the dilemmas therein</u>

A sample of teachers across grade levels at Orchards were given both a semi-structured interview concerning curriculum issues (N = 4; see appendix B) and a survey concerning their priorities in the shared decision-making process of curriculum

development (N = 7; see appendix C). There was full consensus that students, at a minimum, indirectly drive the curriculum. As one teacher put it, "Students effect the curriculum totally by their ability level. You have to judge each student and each new class on whether they could master the objectives or not."

Likewise, all the teachers agreed that students should have choices in the methods and procedures which they use to meet objectives. They thought that primary grade students "should have some choice in how to meet objectives and goals...[we should give] students multiple choices of methods of learning the objectives. This can be accomplished through learning centers and with careful guidance by the teacher. But if a student bombs on their choices, the teacher needs to take a more direct approach." At the intermediate grades teachers expressed that "we should set the structure and the students can make choices within that." "Students should have a say, because they will be more interested, but they need to be guided." "They learn what they want to anyway. They need for us to show them why it is necessary for them to learn certain things."

When it comes to specific curricular content the teachers are more cautious and recognize a basic dilemma. "Students aren't ready in the 4th grade to decide whether they want to learn division or not....[although they need] to have a say". One teacher captured the feeling that I have heard echoed throughout many school districts in many parts of America, i.e.,

"We don't have a handle on how kids should effect curriculum. We don't know how to include them. We don't know how to ask them for help." Clearly "students should have some choice, but they don't know what they need to know. They have choices in how to meet objectives, but we can't have the curriculum run by the students."

In summary, based on teachers' value of shared-decision-making, they encourage students to find their own style and make their own decisions about many ways of meeting pre-set curricular objectives. But based on the teachers' value of "knowledge", they believe that the immature of the human species will not choose, often enough, to learn the culturally empowering and enabling knowledge without the direct guidance of the teacher. Likewise, based on the worthiness of "fairness", they believe that if the students aren't guided through certain specific content, they will be retarded as citizens in a society in which specific information is a crucial factor in both the workplace and the governmental democratic process.

A similar struggle is found in the teachers' approach to democratic discipline. How much power in disciplinary and rule setting action should be shared and how much should be retained by the teacher? One approach that the teachers have been considering is differential classroom democratic structures based on social-cognitive stages extrapolated from Kohlberg's work on the "just community" (Kohlberg, 1984; Murphy, 1988; Reimer,

Paolitto, & Hersh, 1983; Powers, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989). What forms of democracy are appropriate for first, third or sixth grade classrooms?

The curriculum input survey that the Orchards teachers completed had a Likert rating scale that used four choices for rating the importance of the different constituents of the curriculum process: 1) not important; 2) somewhat important; 3) important; and 4) very important. The survey also had a hierarchy scale, in which the teachers rated constituents in order of importance (see appendix C). The results of the survey, which was completed by 54% of the regular education teachers, showed that all but one teacher thought that the teachers' input was "very important". All of the participants rated the teachers' power over the curriculum as the most important of all constituents. As for student input, most teachers rated it "important", one rated it not important, two rated it somewhat important, and none thought it to be "very important". On the hierarchic scale teachers' ordering of the importance of student input ranged from second most important to least important.

Generally, in asking "who owns the curriculum in a democratic society", the Orchards faculty agree with Della-Dora (1976) that the teachers, parents, students, central office and administrators, local school board and governmental agencies need to work together in making curriculum decisions. All these sources have legitimate claims to input that will affect the

future generations, and shared decision making in an atmosphere of respect is the key to serving the students' and society's best interests.

Involvement of parents, however, brings up the same concerns as involving students. The dilemma is between the parents having a very important stake in what their children learn, but lacking the expertise to give adequately informed opinion. The teachers agree that "parents should be on curriculum committees and take surveys to give input on what is important", "but they should not have the final word--they don't have the education to decide what curriculum is needed". "Parents should have a say, but they [often] don't have the educational background. Teachers have gone to college in education. I wouldn't tell an accountant how to do his job. If we could tell parents what kind of help we need, they might help. Input from them is great, but do they have the background? We should work on educating the parents to be helpful in curriculum decisions, and they could be very supportive." "Parents should have input into curriculum--but ideally curriculum needs to be based on research of what children need". Parents are encouraged to be involved at Orchards, and share input on many committees.

Another important dilemma concerning empowering teachers to have some margin of control over the curricular objectives was succinctly stated by one Orchards teacher: "if they [administrators] give us more power over the curriculum, but not

more time to work on it we will give it up!" If the educational innovators call for participatory management (Herrick, 1985; Lumley, 1979), if they call for the lengthy time that real consensual democratic decisions take (Mortenson, 1988), if they call for restructuring the "hidden curriculum" to really meet the democratic ideal of "equal opportunity" for all (Wilcox, 1982), if we expect teachers to be more than high-level technicians, to be "transformative intellectuals" (Giroux, 1985; Smithson, 1983), and we expect them to do that while maintaining a full day of contact hours with their students, we are setting them, and our society, up for failure. It is humanly impossible for an elementary teacher to have a family, be involved in a community, have a modicum of recreation, AND be on committees that restructure education and curricula, AND perform action research in their classroom, AND stay abreast of research in educational journals and conferences to increase their skills, AND teach a full day. This brings up a great question of worth that is facing the American public. If we want our society to improve, or perhaps even survive, we must collectively allocate the quantity and quality of resources into the one arena that can do that -- public education.

This paper will end on a note that teachers at Orchards urged to be included in this paper. The democratic skills of shared decision making which they have gained and are still gaining, through their own learning in the Mastery in Learning

Project, have given them both the confidence to forge ahead with their own ideas, and the communicative skills to resolve differences and explain themselves to peers, parents, students and administrators. In the long run, modeling this before students may be the most powerful curricular change.

References

Della-Dora, D. (1976). Democracy and education: Who owns the curriculum? Educational Leadership, 34, 51-59.

Dreikurs, R., & Grey, L. (1968). Logical consequences. New York: Meredith Press.

Dreikurs, R., & Cassels, P. (1974). Discipline without tears, 2nd ed. New York: Hawthorne.

Dreikurs, R., Grunwald, B. B., & Pepper, F. C. (1982). Maintaining sanity in the classroom, 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row.

Dunn, R. (1984). Learning style: State of the science. Theory into Practice, 23, 10-19.

Giroux, H.A. (1985). Teachers as transformative intellectuals. Social Education, 49, 376-379.

Herrick, N.Q. (1985). Is the time finally ripe for educational democracy? Social Policy, 16, 53-56.

Kohlberg, L. (1984). The psychology of moral development. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Lumley, D. D. (1979). Participation in educational decision making. Educational Horizons, 57, 123-125.

Mortenson, A. (1988). The primary school, the future, and democracy. Western European Education, 20, 73-87.

Murphy, D. F. (1988). The just community at Birch Meadow Elementary School. Phi Delta Kappan, 427-428.

Powers, C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). Moral

education, community and justice. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reimer, J., Paolitto, D. P., & Hersh, R. (1983). Promoting moral growth, 2nd ed. New York: Longman.

Smithson, A. (1983). Philosophic competence, educational policy, and the technocratic threat to democracy. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 17, 275-284.

Wilcox, K. (1982). Differential socialization in the classroom: Implications for equal opportunity. In G. Spindler (Ed.), Doing the ethnography of schooling. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Appendix A

A Statement on Shared Decision Making

From the Orchards Elementary School

This statement was drafted by the consultant to the NEA Mastery in Learning Project (MILP) site, Orchards Elementary School, following discussions in the Steering Committee on two topics: how 'should' shared decision making (SDM) take place in an elementary school, and how 'does' it currently take place at Orchards. The statement has been adopted by the Orchards Steering Committee as policy.

Making decisions together is a major factor in MILP and in restructuring schools. Consulting between levels of hierarchy is a form of democracy in action. In local school districts four hierarchic levels are manifest: 1) students, 2) teachers, 3) principals, 4) superintendent/central office. Democracy (and shared decision making) can only have an impact if members of a community care about each other, and give each other equal respect. Caring is usually demonstrated by a concern with each other's feelings; respect is shown by inquiring about each other's opinions on important matters, even when those opinions differ. However, equal respect does not mean equal power in a democracy. Teachers' power isn't equal to students', and a principal's power isn't the same as teachers'. It does mean that we have to still care about people's feelings who don't ask our opinion; and that we have to invite others opinions, even when we

aren't sure they care about us at the moment.

Shared decision making should happen throughout all hierarchic levels. Teachers should allow their students to make some real decisions as a group; the younger the students, the more power the teacher keeps; the older the students, the more power the teacher shares. As has been demonstrated in MiLP, shared decision making can occur among principals and teachers; it can also occur between parents and the schools, and between superintendents and principals.

Currently, at Orchards, democracy has taken on a form that could be stylized as president-senate-committee. The major forum for shared decision making takes place in the Steering Committee, which acts like a senate. The principal maintains both a status as president of the senate (in which he retains a full veto power of decisions made), and member of the senate, in which he has one equal voice with the other Steering Committee members. A major factor of restructuring, and shared decision making, is that issues of concern to any teacher-member of our community may be made public in one of two appropriate forums. These two forums are described in the next two paragraphs.

First, if the issue relates to one of the listed goals of our Four Committees (Teacher-Teacher, Teacher-Community, Teacher-Administrator, Teacher-Student), the issue should be taken directly to that Committee. Then, that committee will share decision making in deciding what to do with the recommendation.

It could drop it, modify it, and/or send it to the Steering Committee.

Second, if the issue doesn't relate to a Committee goal, it should be written on the list of items for the general faculty meeting. In that meeting another form of shared decision making takes place, in which the faculty group has several options, including: dropping the question, making an action decision about the issue, passing it to a committee in original or modified form, or sending it to the Steering Committee.

Appendix B

Please consider the following questions in two ways:

To what degree have you been involved in some of the following questions?

In what way would you like to see them implemented?

1. Does the administration allow you to make decisions about the curriculum?

What decisions have you made? What kind would you like to make?

2. How do your students effect your curriculum decisions?

What way(s) are your students helping make decisions over their curriculum?

3. In what way should parents (or others) be involved in curriculum decisions?

The basic question is again on Shared Decision Making. Who shares in making decisions about curriculum? Who should share this?

Appendix C

SURVEY FOR CURRICULUM INPUT
Mastery in Learning Project
Orchard's Elementary School and Lewis-Clark State College

Please mark the scale on the right that matches your opinion of the topic on the left. All statements below concern choices of appropriate curriculum.

Not Important = 1; Somewhat Important = 2; Important = 3; Very Important = 4

	1	2	3	4
1. Students having input into the curriculum is	//	//	//	//
2. Teachers having input into the curriculum in their own classroom is	//	//	//	//
3. The principal having input into his/her building's curriculum is	//	//	//	//
4. The district's curriculum director & the central office having input is	//	//	//	//
5. The local school board having curriculum input is	//	//	//	//
6. The LEA having curriculum input is	//	//	//	//
7. Direct vote of the parents/populace in a school district to effect curriculum is	//	//	//	//
8. The State Board having curriculum input is	//	//	//	//
9. The SEA having curriculum input is	//	//	//	//
10. The State Legislature effecting curriculum is	//	//	//	//
11. The Federal Congress effecting curriculum is	//	//	//	//
12. The NEA having curriculum input is	//	//	//	//
13. The education department of the United Nations offering local curriculum input is	//	//	//	//

[Continued on the next page]

Please order in the level of importance for making curriculum decisions;
1 = most important; 13 = least important:

Students in the class	_____	The SEA	_____
The Teacher of the class	_____	The State Congress	_____
The principal	_____	The Federal Congress	_____
The central office	_____	The NEA	_____
The parents/citizens	_____	The United Nations	_____
The local school board	_____		
The LEA	_____		
The State Board	_____		

Please write any comments you have on these topics below, or on the back.

Appendix D

Date: 30 May 1990

To: The Faculty of Orchards Elementary School

From: Rhett Diessner, MILP Consultant

Re: Evaluation of the May 1990 Faculty Inventory

Attached to this report is a full listing of average codings of the 12 faculty that participated in the current administration of the Faculty Inventory. Next to the averages are the ranges of responses, and below that are listed the discrepancy scores. Following this, each item has the transcribed explanation from the several persons who offered written responses.

Of the twenty-five items, three items (6, 9, & 12) were discrepant by 4 units or more and these should be considered the primary target for planned change. There were also five items (4, 8, 10, 11, 25) that were discrepant 3-4 units and these should be considered the secondary targets.

The primary goal of administering this version of the Faculty Inventory was to help set priorities for the future. It cannot be directly compared to the original Faculty Inventory, as perception of the level of importance of items may change over four years, as well as the faculty's criteria for "what is", i.e., the extent to which conditions currently exist in the school. With that in mind, it is interesting to note faculty perceived improvement in conditions between 1986 and 1990 in 18/25 items, and the discrepancy between items lessened in 20/25 items.

Basically, this is quite a positive finding, i.e., we have examined the areas that were the most discrepant in 1986, and have found not only improvement in some, but improvement in most (72-80%). With the thought that we have made significant gains and improvement in the past, lets look to the most problematic areas to consider improvement in the future. The following three items were the ones that had the greatest current discrepancies:

6.6k. Teachers are provided the time and opportunity to coordinate lesson plans and teaching strategies with their colleagues.

Average of What is:	2.25	Range: 1-5
Average of Importance:	7.25	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	5.00	
1986 Average of What is:	2.33	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.07	

1986 Discrepancy: 4.74

"Absolutely not! This is a real need area! The year we did specific scheduling it was great. All student needs were definitely met. No one 'fell' through the cracks. Now we seem to be back to doing our own thing--no co-planning or correlation time with grade level or with support services."

"We still need more time daily!"

9.8d. School-based administrators spend a significant amount of time in classrooms and/or working directly with teachers to improve curriculum and instruction.

Average of What is:	2.75	Range: 1-5
Average of Importance:	7.00	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	4.25	
1986 Average of What is:	3.07	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.27	
1986 Discrepancy:	4.20	

"We need Doug [the principal] to participate more in our classrooms--just the visibility would be good."

12.9g. Parents work in a partnership with staff and students to develop and maintain acceptable student behavior.

Average of What is:	3.58	Range: 1-6
Average of Importance:	7.58	Range: 7-8
Discrepancy:	4.00	
1986 Average of What is:	4.53	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.53	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.00	

"Most parents have little contact with the school."

"Only a few parents seem to be doing this."

I recommend that the Steering Committee put these three areas on the top of their agenda for the Fall, and that the four subcommittees consider adopting, or adapting, these goals.

NEA MASTERY IN LEARNING PROJECT
MAY 1990 FACULTY INVENTORY
SUMMARIZATION OF DATA

WHAT IS-- the extent to which which this practice/condition is present in your school.	IMPORTANCE--the extent to this practice/condition is important in determining the quality of the school.
1-- Never present	1-- No importance to school quality
2-- Limited	2-- Very little importance
3-- Some	3-- Little importance
4-- Less than 1/2 the time	4-- Some importance
5-- More than 1/2 the time	5-- Important
6-- Often	6-- Very Important
7-- Usually	7-- Great Average of Importance
8-- Always present	8-- Essential to school quality

1.1j. Teachers participate in determining the organization of the school.

Average of What is: 5.50 Range: 3-7
Average of Importance: 7.17 Range: 5-8
Discrepancy: 1.67
1986 Average of What is: 3.87
1986 Average of Importance: 7.07
1986 Discrepancy: 3.20

"There have been gains, but there is a need for more."

"There is a management down form of school management in this district (at the top administrative level). Therefore, our individual school participation is encumbered even though we seek to have site-based decision making at Orchards."

2.3f. Students share responsibility for achieving school goals & objectives.

Average of What is: 3.75 Range: 2-5
Average of Importance: 5.75 Range: 2-8
Discrepancy: 2.00
1986 Average of What is: 3.87
1986 Average of Importance: 6.93
1986 Discrepancy: 3.06

"I feel we fall short of student involvement in goals and objectives. I think our focus has been more on faculty rather than students--"

3.6b. Faculty members share in decision to change and improve the learning environment of the school.

Average of What is: 5.67 Range: 4-8

Average of Importance: 7.33 Range: 6-8
Discrepancy: 1.66
1986 Average of What is: 4.47
1986 Average of Importance: 7.67
1986 Discrepancy: 3.20

"Although we have progressed in this area in the last 4 years, we are still struggling with the concept."

4.6h. Teachers seek to improve their practice through classroom observations of other teachers.
Average of What is: 2.83 Range: 1-5
Average of Importance: 6.25 Range: 5-8
Discrepancy: 3.42
1986 Average of What is: 2.33
1986 Average of Importance: 6.73
1986 Discrepancy: 4.40

"There was a time this was encouraged and provided for, but it has fallen by the wayside the last two years. It is a real need--especially with some very effective teachers doing some very creative/new strategies, such as cooperative learning techniques. We need to share, to learn, to communicate--both effective people and methods!"

5.6g. Teachers frequently seek constructive criticism form their colleagues.
Average of What is: 3.25 Range: 1-7
Average of Importance: 5.67 Range: 2-8
Discrepancy: 2.42
1986 Average of What is: 3.47
1986 Average of Importance: 6.87
1986 Discrepancy: 3.40

"No!"

6.6k. Teachers are provided the time and opportunity to coordinate lesson plans and teaching strategies with their colleagues.
Average of What is: 2.25 Range: 1-5
Average of Importance: 7.25 Range: 5-8
Discrepancy: 5.00
1986 Average of What is: 2.33
1986 Average of Importance: 7.07
1986 Discrepancy: 4.74

"Absolutely not! This is a real need area! The year we did specific scheduling it was great. All student needs were definitely met. No one 'fell' through the cracks. Now we seem to be back to doing our own thing--no co-planning or correlation time with grade level or with support services."

"We still need more time daily!"

7.8b. School-based administrators maintain a balance between a strong leadership role and maximum autonomy for teachers.

Average of What is:	5.55	Range: 3-8
Average of Importance:	7.18	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	1.63	
1986 Average of What is:	4.07	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.53	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.46	

"Doug [the principal] has been very open and agreeable in trying shared decision making methods. There are some bumps in the road, but we have definitely made good strides to work 'together'."

8.8c. School-based administrators provide opportunities for teachers to work together to improve instruction.

Average of What is:	4.00	Range: 1-6
Average of Importance:	7.17	Range: 6-8
Discrepancy:	3.17	
1986 Average of What is:	3.87	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.47	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.60	

"This is not available at this time, but badly needed. There are grade to grade level meetings 1 or 2X a year, but that does not meet the needs of the students."

9.8d. School-based administrators spend a significant amount of time in classrooms and/or working directly with teachers to improve curriculum and instruction.

Average of What is:	2.75	Range: 1-5
Average of Importance:	7.00	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	4.25	
1986 Average of What is:	3.07	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.27	
1986 Discrepancy:	4.20	

"We need Doug [the principal] to participate more in our classrooms--just the visibility would be good."

10.8e. School-based administrators often interact with students and take a personal interest in their progress.

Average of What is:	3.92	Range: 2-7
Average of Importance:	7.17	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	3.25	
1986 Average of What is:	3.73	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.40	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.67	

"It would be good if Doug [the principal] was out on the playground more--actually interacting with students."

11.9a. Parents are involved in activities that relate directly to improving student performance.

Average of What is:	3.42	Range: 2-6
Average of Importance:	7.17	Range: 4-8
Discrepancy:	3.75	
1986 Average of What is:	4.20	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.33	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.13	

"Most parents have little contact with the school."

12.9g. Parents work in a partnership with staff and students to develop and maintain acceptable student behavior.

Average of What is:	3.58	Range: 1-6
Average of Importance:	7.58	Range: 7-8
Discrepancy:	4.00	
1986 Average of What is:	4.53	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.53	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.00	

"Most parents have little contact with the school."
"Only a few parents seem to be doing this."

13.10c. Staff development activities assist teachers to understand and use new curriculum and new curriculum materials.

Average of What is:	4.83	Range: 3-7
Average of Importance:	7.08	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	2.25	
1986 Average of What is:	4.07	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.36	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.29	

"We always seem to have good intentions but not enough time to really become aware of methods to effectively teach new curriculum. CIRC [a cooperative learning program] is a good example of a method in need of staff development activities."

14.10d. Teachers participate in planning staff development opportunities.

Average of What is:	4.58	Range: 2-8
Average of Importance:	7.00	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	2.42	
1986 Average of What is:	3.79	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.14	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.35	

15.10g. Faculty members are trained to coordinate lesson planning and teaching strategies.

Average of What is:	4.45	Range: 2-7
Average of Importance:	7.09	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	2.64	
1986 Average of What is:	3.64	
1986 Average of Importance:	6.86	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.22	

"No! But it is needed."

16.11a. Appropriate activities and materials are available for all students.

Average of What is:	6.00	Range: 4-8
Average of Importance:	7.67	Range: 6-8
Discrepancy:	1.67	
1986 Average of What is:	4.40	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.67	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.27	

"Most students, but not all."

"The district has some weak areas when it comes to servicing exceptional children. However, the resource and consulting staff make every effort to assist the children."

17.12g. For each subject area there is coordination among all grade levels so that teachers know what has been and will be taught to a given class.

Average of What is:	5.67	Range: 1-8
Average of Importance:	7.75	Range: 7-8
Discrepancy:	2.08	
1986 Average of What is:	4.00	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.30	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.30	

"Curriculum goals/objectives 'sort-of' dictate coordination to some degree. Beyond that, there is minimal coordination."

18.13b. Evaluation procedures are defined for assessing the complete range of goals and objectives including cognitive, affective, and psychomotor development.

Average of What is:	5.18	Range: 3-7
Average of Importance:	6.91	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	1.73	
1986 Average of What is:	4.13	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.13	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.00	

"Cognitive only."

"I think we are putting to much importance in testing. I think most of us are teaching to tests."

"Not certain about new evaluation procedures."

"No."

19.14b. Teachers participate in systematic reviews of the curriculum's effectiveness.

Average of What is:	4.92	Range: 3-6
Average of Importance:	7.33	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	2.41	
1986 Average of What is:	4.43	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.67	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.24	

20.14c. Teacher recommendations are used for designing revisions in the curriculum.

Average of What is:	5.33	Range: 2-8
Average of Importance:	7.50	Range: 7-8
Discrepancy:	2.17	
1986 Average of What is:	4.67	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.67	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.00	

"I don't think teachers are really listened to."

21.15a. Communication in this school is open, positive, and timely.

Average of What is:	5.83	Range: 4-8
Average of Importance:	7.75	Range: 7-8
Discrepancy:	1.92	
1986 Average of What is:	4.67	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.74	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.07	

"Much improved."

22.15b. Site-based administrators routinely communicate school goals, objectives, and procedures to staff, students, and parents.

Average of What is:	4.58	Range: 2-7
Average of Importance:	7.33	Range: 5-8
Discrepancy:	2.75	
1986 Average of What is:	4.07	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.60	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.53	

23.15e. Department/subject matter disciplines/grade leaders routinely communicate with other staff.

Average of What is:	4.64	Range: 2-7
Average of Importance:	7.45	Range: 6-8
Discrepancy:	2.81	

1986 Average of What is:	4.00
1986 Average of Importance:	7.57
1986 Discrepancy:	3.57

"We aren't given the time to communicate."

"No."

24.15f. Articulation occurs regularly among staff members across departmental/discipline/grade levels.

Average of What is:	4.73	Range: 2-7
Average of Importance:	7.45	Range: 6-8
Discrepancy:	2.72	
1986 Average of What is:	4.60	
1986 Average of Importance:	7.60	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.00	

"We aren't given the time to communicate."

25.15k. Evidence of student achievement (e.g., test results and grading reports) is effectively communicated to the press and to others.

Average of What is:	3.08	Range: 1-7
Average of Importance:	6.50	Range: 2-8
Discrepancy:	3.42	
1986 Average of What is:	3.60	
1986 Average of Importance:	6.93	
1986 Discrepancy:	3.33	

"The district determines this communication. Student achievement reports to parents are handled at the individual school level."

General comments:

"We've been trying to communicate better at grade levels and across grade levels. The two years we could work under Mary's schedule helped in this area a great deal. This year made a decline with separate recesses and the changes made to accommodate P.E. cut out the time to confer with Reading/Resource and other special service people."

"I like the shared-decision making we do and feel we work better as a staff than before MIL. Our faculty mtgs. are more efficiently & effectively run. I like the opportunity to be convener. I also like the way we try to schedule classes (PE, music, etc) so that each grade has a particular time scheduled daily & schedules are more consistent."

"Aside from the democracy in the classroom and conflict manager projects, we never really chose goals that directly impacted on changing student behavior or learning styles. However, we appear

ready to go in that direction. The networking system should be a valuable tool for research and project development. The communication skills and opportunities that developed from MIL are valuable assets to the staff. I think the individual staff members benefitted from this project in many ways. Evidently, we were needy!"

"I think MIL is a wonderful program--definitely a needed program. 'Cooperative learning' isn't just for kids. The years we were provided with time to work with our committees, we were very effective and made real gains, both for our students and ourselves. However, without TIME to address issues, it has 'gone down the tubes'. But, shared decision making is the way we need to go! I'd hate to see us lose all we have gained these last 4 yrs."